IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW MEXICO

JARROD B. FOSTER,

Plaintiff,

v. No. CV 15-1047 CG/LAM

NOVA HARDBANDING, LLC, et al.

Defendants.

ORDER DENYING AS MOOT DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO DISMISS

THIS MATTER came before the Court upon *Defendant Kenneth Bromley's*Motion to Dismiss Under Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(4), and Subject Thereto, Defendants'

Original Answer ("Motion to Dismiss"), (Doc. 17), filed December 30, 2015.

Subsequently, on January 4, 2016, Plaintiff filed his *First Amended Complaint*, (Doc. 20), pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(a)(1)(B). An amended complaint supersedes a prior complaint "and renders it of no legal effect." *Davis v. TXO Production Corp.*, 929 F.2d 1515, 1517 (10th Cir. 1991) (internal quotation marks omitted) (quoting *Int'l Controls Corp. v. Vesco*, 556 F.2d 665, 668 (2d Cir. 1977)). Therefore, the Court may deny as moot a motion for default judgment, because the motion is invalidated by the filing of an amended complaint. *Marotta v. Cortez*, No. 08-cv-02421-CMA-CBS, 2008 WL 5044496, at *1 (D. Colo. Nov. 20, 2008) (unpublished) (citing *Vanguard Fin. Serv. Corp. v. Johnson*, 736 F.Supp. 832, 835 (N.D. III. 1990); *Best Western Int'l, Inc. v. Melbourne Hotel Investors, LLC*, No. CV 06-2276-PHX-MHM, 2007 WL 2990132, at *2 (D. Ariz. Oct. 11, 2007) (unpublished)); *Ogunsalu v. Nair*, No. 06-55842, 264 Fed. Appx. 672, 674 (9th Cir. Jan. 22, 2008) (unpublished) (Filing an amended complaint

"render[ed] [the] motion for entry of default judgment as to the original complaint untimely.") As the Original Complaint no longer has any effect, the Motion to Dismiss is moot.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Defendant Kenneth Bromley's Motion to Dismiss Under Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(4), and Subject Thereto, Defendants' Original Answer, (Doc. 17), is **DENIED AS MOOT**.

THE HONORABLE CARMEN E. GARZA UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE